

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-47 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 10-12, 14-27, 37, and 40-47 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-47 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,449,653 (hereinafter “Klemets”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054964 (hereinafter “Bozdagi”).

**Claim Objections**

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for noting the misspelling of “textual” in claim. Applicants have corrected this typographical error.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-47 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Klemets in view of Bozdagi.

Applicants respectfully submit that Klemets and Bozdagi, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-47. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-47 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “selecting a set of one or more keyframes with the presentation recorder device from the analyzed video information received from the first system or the analyzed video information received from the capture device in response to a user-configurable threshold and the textual difference between a first video frame and a second video frame.” As recited in amended claim 1, one or more optical

character recognition techniques are used by the presentation recorder device to determine a textual difference between video frames.

In contrast, the combination of Klemets and Bozdagi fails to disclose the above recited limitation of amended claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges that Klemets fails to determine any differences between frames based on a user threshold. However, Bozdagi fails to disclose that textual differences between frames are determined based on a user threshold as recited in amended claim 1.

Based upon the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Klemets and Bozdagi fails to teach or suggest each and every one of the claim limitations recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 14, 27 and 40 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-13, 15-26 and 44-47, 28-39, 41-43 and that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 14, 27, and 40 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/728,453  
Amdt. dated April 23, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2008

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61764787 v1